

1 STEPHEN P. BERZON (#46540)  
 2 sberzon@altshulerberzon.com  
 3 LINDA LYÉ (#215584)  
 4 llye@altshulerberzon.com  
 5 Altshuler Berzon LLP  
 6 177 Post Street, Suite 300  
 7 San Francisco, CA 94108  
 8 Telephone: (415) 421-7151  
 9 Facsimile: (415) 362-8064

10 Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
 11 SKYWEST PILOTS ALPA ORGANIZING  
 12 COMMITTEE, et al. ELIZABETH GINSBURG  
 13 (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)  
 14 elizabeth.ginsburg@alpa.org  
 15 Air Line Pilots Association, International  
 16 1625 Massachusetts Ave, NW 8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
 17 Washington, DC 20036  
 18 Telephone: (202) 797-4095  
 19 Facsimile: (202) 452-0556

20 Norman A. Quandt (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)  
 21 Ford & Harrison LLP  
 22 1275 Peachtree Street, N.E., Suite 600  
 23 Atlanta, GA 30309  
 24 Telephone: 404-888-3845  
 25 Facsimile: 404-888-3863  
 26 Email: [nquandt@fordharrison.com](mailto:nquandt@fordharrison.com)

27 Douglas W. Hall (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)  
 28 FORD & HARRISON LLP  
 1300 Nineteenth Street, N.W., Suite 700  
 Washington, DC 20036  
 Telephone: 202-719-2065  
 Facsimile: 202-719-2077  
 Email: [dhall@fordharrison.com](mailto:dhall@fordharrison.com)

29 Robert Spagat (SBN: 157388)  
 30 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP  
 31 101 California Street  
 32 San Francisco, CA 94111-5894  
 33 Telephone: 415-591-1000  
 34 Facsimile: 415-591-1400  
 35 Email: [rspagat@winston.com](mailto:rspagat@winston.com)

36 Attorneys for Defendant  
 37 SKYWEST AIRLINES, INC.

38  
 39  
 40  
 41  
 42  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
**SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

1 SKYWEST PILOTS ALPA ORGANIZING  
 2 COMMITTEE, et al.,

3 Plaintiffs,

4 vs.

5 SKYWEST AIRLINES, INC.,

6 Defendant.

**Case No. C-07-2688 CRB**

**STIPULATED MOTION TO MODIFY  
 SUMMARY JUDGMENT DEADLINES**

Judge: Hon. Charles R. Breyer

Action Filed: May 22, 2007

7 Pursuant to Local Rule 7-11 and 7-12, Plaintiffs SkyWest Pilots ALPA Organizing  
 8 Committee, *et al.*, and Defendant SkyWest Airlines, Inc. ("SkyWest") hereby file this stipulated  
 9 motion requesting that the Court modify the current summary judgment deadlines in this case. To  
 10 date, the parties have diligently engaged in discovery. Unfortunately, discovery disputes have arisen  
 11 and, despite extensive efforts to meet and confer, the parties have not yet been able to resolve all of  
 12 those disputes. The parties therefore need additional time to resolve the outstanding discovery  
 13 issues, including the filing of motions to compel if necessary, and to take further discovery before  
 14 filing any motions for summary judgment.

15 In support of their motion, the parties stipulate as follows:

16 WHEREAS, at a Case Management Conference held on December 14, 2007, the Court  
 17 scheduled August 1, 2008 as the date on which a hearing would be held on motions for summary  
 18 judgment in this matter. To be heard that day, the parties' summary judgment motions would have  
 19 to be filed no later than June 29, 2008.

20 WHEREAS, since the Case Management Conference, the parties have diligently engaged in  
 21 discovery. Defendant has propounded 22 interrogatories on the organizational Plaintiffs and 10  
 22 interrogatories on each of the individual Plaintiffs, as well as 61 requests for production of  
 23 documents ("RFPs") on the organizational Plaintiffs and 27 RFPs on each of the individual  
 24 Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs have responded to the written discovery. Plaintiffs have propounded three sets  
 25 of interrogatories, three sets of requests for production of documents and one set of requests for  
 26  
 27  
 28

Winston & Strawn LLP  
 101 California Street  
 San Francisco, CA 94111-5894

1 admission. Defendant has responded to all of this written discovery, except the last set of RFPs  
2 which is due June 20. Plaintiffs have also issued third-party subpoenas.

3 WHEREAS, Defendant has issued a 30(b)(6) deposition notice and deposition notices for the  
4 individual plaintiffs.

5 WHEREAS, Plaintiffs have also issued a 30(b)(6) deposition notices, deposition notices of  
6 various individuals, and two third-party deposition notices.

8 WHEREAS, various disputes have arisen between the parties regarding the appropriate scope  
9 of discovery and the adequacy of the responses provided to certain of the requests.

10 WHEREAS, the parties have met and conferred extensively to resolve these disputes, some  
11 of which have been resolved by the parties, but others of which remain outstanding. The parties are  
12 continuing to work together in an effort to narrow the areas of their disagreement, and are optimistic  
13 that they will be able to do so.

15 WHEREAS, despite the parties' best efforts to resolve their discovery disputes through the  
16 meet and confer process, it is nonetheless likely that there will be certain discovery issues that the  
17 parties will have to bring before the Court for resolution.

18 WHEREAS, many of the depositions cannot sensibly be taken until after the discovery  
19 disputes that are likely to be the subject of one or more motions to compel are resolved. For  
20 example, Plaintiffs object to the appropriate scope of some the 30(b)(6) depositions that Defendant  
21 has noticed and so those 30(b)(6) depositions cannot proceed until after the dispute is resolved. In  
22 addition, each party has objected to the adequacy of the opposing party's document production and  
23 until the disputes over written discovery are resolved, it is not possible for most of the depositions to  
24 proceed.

26 WHEREAS, after outstanding discovery disputes are resolved by the Court, the party ordered  
27 to provide further discovery responses will need a reasonable additional time to respond, and the  
28 party propounding such discovery will need a reasonable additional time to review any such

1 responses before taking depositions.

2 WHEREAS, even if the parties file a motion to compel as early as this week, any such  
3 motion would not be resolved until at the earliest five weeks later, in late July, documents under  
4 such a schedule would not be produced until some time in August, and depositions could then be  
5 scheduled for late August, but more likely September at the earliest.

6 WHEREAS, it is unlikely that all motions to compel can be filed as early as this week. This  
7 is so because although the parties continue to meet and confer over one issue that may be the subject  
8 of a motion to compel, viz., the adequacy of the search for documents performed by Defendant in  
9 response to Plaintiffs' document requests, Plaintiffs may need to take a 30(b)(6) deposition before  
10 they are able to file a motion to compel, as a result of which a motion to compel on this particular  
11 dispute could not be filed for a few weeks.

12 WHEREAS, because the deponents are located across the country and counsel in this case  
13 are also located in three separate cities, scheduling considerations will make it impracticable to  
14 complete depositions before the end of September at the very earliest.

15 WHEREAS, after the depositions in this case are complete, the parties will require a  
16 reasonable additional time to prepare their respective motions for summary judgment.

17 WHEREAS, the current summary judgment deadline set by the Court requires the parties to  
18 file their opening summary judgment briefs on or before June 29, 2008 but does not provide the  
19 parties with sufficient time to obtain a resolution from the Court on their outstanding discovery  
20 disputes and to take discovery that each side believes is necessary to its summary judgment filings.

21 WHEREAS, allowing the parties to obtain Court resolution of their outstanding discovery  
22 disputes and take follow-up discovery will permit the parties to present the Court with a complete  
23 record on summary judgment.

24 WHEREAS, the parties have met and conferred on a schedule that would allow the parties to  
25 complete the meet and confer process, file motions to compel as necessary, respond to and take  
26

1 follow-up discovery in an orderly fashion, and prepare their summary judgment papers in an orderly  
2 fashion.

3 THEREFORE, for the reasons set forth above, the parties jointly request that the Court  
4 vacate the current August 1, 2008 deadline for a summary judgment hearing in this case and adopt  
5 the following schedule which is compatible with the schedule of all counsel in this case:  
6

7 Opening summary judgment briefs to be filed on October 31, 2008

8 Briefs in opposition to be filed on November 14, 2008

9 Reply briefs to be filed on November 24, 2008

10 Summary judgment hearing on December 12, 2008<sup>1</sup>

12 Dated: June 10, 2008

WINSTON & STRAWN LLP

14 By: /s/  
15 Robert Spagat  
16 Attorneys for Defendant  
17 SKYWEST AIRLINES, INC.  
18

Dated: June 10, 2008

ALTSCHULER BERZON LLP

20 By: /s/  
21 Linda Lye  
22 Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
23 SKYWEST PILOTS ALPA  
24 ORGANIZING COMMITTEE, ET  
25 AL.  
26  
27  
28

---

1 December 12, 2008 is the first law and motion date in December on which all counsel are available.

## ORDER

For good cause shown and pursuant to stipulation, the October 2, 2007 Case Management Order is hereby VACATED and the following summary judgment schedule is adopted:

Opening summary judgment briefs to be filed on October 31, 2008.

Briefs in opposition to be filed on November 14, 2008.

Reply briefs to be filed on November 24, 2008.

Summary judgment hearing on December 12, 2008.

Dated: June 11, 2008

The Honorable Charles R. Brever  
United States District Court

United States District Court  
IS SO ORDERED

Judge Charles R. Breyer